



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,026	12/04/2001	Chee Hung Ben Choi	16675/94636-00	9518
33222	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
JONES, WALKER, WAECHTER, POITEVENT, CARRERE & DENEGRE, L.L.P. 5TH FLOOR, FOUR UNITED PLAZA 8555 UNITED PLAZA BOULEVARD BATON ROUGE, LA 70809			NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/005,026	CHOI, CHEE HUNG BEN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Le Nguyen	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: 44 of line 8, page 11. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

2. The specification is objected to because they do not mention the following reference character(s) depicted in the drawing: 44 of fig. 7.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 18-20 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 ("Netscape").

As per claim 1, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links, comprising:

prearranging computer files to form a default directory (fig. 2, *default directory 210*);

retrieving user customization data and reconfiguring a copy of said default directory based on said user customization data, thereby creating an individualized user directory (figs. 3-4; *using customization data retrieved via menus 310 and 410, the default directory is reconfigured to form an individualized directory*).

As per claim 2, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links wherein the default directory includes files in the Internet and/or an Intranet (fig. 2, *element 210*).

As per claim 3, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising adding files into or removing files from said default directory (fig. 3, *element 320*).

As per claim 5, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising storing user customization data in a user computer (fig. 5).

As per claim 6, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising providing a user interface for a user to modify files in said user directory (figs. 2-4).

As per claim 7, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links wherein said modification of files in said user directory is at least one of opening, cutting, copying, pasting, deleting, or renaming (fig. 4, *elements 420 and 430*).

As per claim 8, Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said user customization data based on the arrangements or modifications by a user (fig. 5).

Claim 18 is similar in scope to claim 1 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 20 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 24 is similar in scope to claim 7 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is similar in scope to claim 8 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 ("Netscape") in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Windows NT ("MS Win").

As per claim 4, although Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links and allowing user access to the default directory (figs. 2-5), Netscape does not explicitly disclose allowing multiple client computers to access the default directory on a server computer. MS Win teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising allowing multiple client computers to access the default directory on a server computer (fig. 2; *depicted is a shared directory or network directory*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include MS Win's teaching of allowing multiple client computers to access the default directory on a server computer in a method creating an individualized listing of links to Netscape's teaching of allowing user access to the default directory in a

Art Unit: 2174

method creating an individualized listing of links in order to provide sharing and communication of data between users in different locations in real time.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 4 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 9, 17, 26 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 ("Netscape") in view of Hekmatpour.

As per claim 9, although Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising collecting user customization data in order to form a universal usage history (figs. 2-5), Netscape does not explicitly disclose collecting user customization data from multiple users in order to form a global usage history. Hekmatpour teaches collecting user customization data from multiple users in order to form a universal/global usage history (col. 10, lines 8-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Hekmatpour's collecting user customization data from multiple users in order to form a global usage history to Netscape's collecting user customization data in order to form a universal usage history in order to reduce the amount of time required for accessing useful and relevant topics/subjects.

Claims 17 and 34 individually are similar in scope to the combination of claims 8 and 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 9 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2174

8. Claims 10-16 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Screen Dumps of Netscape 4.75 ("Netscape") in view of Hekmatpour as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Windows NT ("MS Win").

As per claim 10, although the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links wherein users have access to the file or folder modification (Netscape: figs. 2-4), Netscape does not explicitly disclose sending each user request of a file or folder modification from a client computer to a server computer. MS Win teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising sending each user request of a file or folder modification from a client computer to a server computer (fig. 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include MS Win's teaching of creating an individualized listing of links comprising sending each user request of a file or folder modification from a client computer to a server computer to the modified Netscape's teaching of creating an individualized listing of links wherein users have access to the file or folder modification so that users are not restricted to accessing the file or folder modification from one computer but may access the file or folder modification from another client computer located most convenient to the user(s).

As per claim 11, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said global usage history based on subsequent user requests to modify or arrange files or folders (Hekmatpour: col. 10, lines 8-39).

As per claim 12, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising recording a particular directory modification specified by a user request and the number of requests specifying a particular modification (Hekmatpour: col. 10, lines 8-39; col. 11, lines 3-14; *described is a quantitative measure for recording the number of requests specifying a particular modification*).

As per claim 13, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising storing said global usage history in a database (Hekmatpour: col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 6).

As per claim 14, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising updating said default directory based on said global usage history (Hekmatpour: col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 6).

As per claim 15, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising adding, removing, or renaming files or folders in said default directory based on said global usage history (Netscape: figs 2-4; Hekmatpour: col. 3, line 66 through col. 4, line 6).

As per claim 16, the modified Netscape teaches a method for creating an individualized listing of links comprising modifying attributes of files or folders in said default directory based on said global usage history (Hekmatpour: col. 11, lines 3-25).

Claim 27 is similar in scope to claim 10 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 28 is similar in scope to claim 11 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 29 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 30 is similar in scope to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 31 is similar in scope to claim 14 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 32 is similar in scope to claim 15 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Whiteis (US 5,749,081) teaches a system and method for recommending items to a user.

Robinson (US 5,918,014) teaches automated collaborative filtering in World Wide Web advertising.

Hosken (US 6,763,354 B2) teaches mining emergent weighted association rules utilizing backlinking reinforcement analysis.

Bieganski et al. (US 6,412,012) teach a system and method and article of manufacture for making a compatibility-aware recommendation to a user.

Hagan et al. (US 6,734,886) teach a method of customizing a browsing experience on a World Wide Web site.

Culliss (US 6,078,916) teaches a method for organizing information.

Aggarwal et al. (US 6,478,541 B1) teach a system and method for collaborative filtering with applications to e-commerce.

Stemp et al. (US 6,401,094 B1) teach a system and method for presenting information in accordance with user preference.

Bailey et al. (US 6,785,671 B1) teach a system and method for locating web-based product offerings.

### ***Inquiries***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN  
Patent Examiner  
September 2, 2004

KV

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100